REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application and have been examined.

With this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 11. Applicant submits that the amended claim is fully supported by the disclosure. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-20 - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0152267 to Lennon ("Lennon") in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0069900 to Hind ("Hind"). Applicant traverses this rejection.

With regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Lennon and Hind does not disclose or suggest at least "an input unit which receives an index configuration from a user for configuring indexes of multimedia content," as recited in the claim. The Examiner concedes the Lennon fails to disclose or suggest at least these features, and relies on Hind to allegedly disclose that an input unit receives an index configuration from a user. Hind, however, fails to disclose or suggest these claimed features.

Hind discloses selection techniques which enable a user to indicate *criteria* which may be used for organizing stored objects *for an adaptive index* (¶ [0037]). As disclosed by Hind, a multilevel indexing scheme which is based on user behavior is used to organize stored electronic objects. A user customizable relational model allows rendered objects to be organized according to one or more criteria (¶ [0038]). Further, *criteria for use in the index are learned* by detecting

occurrences of user configurable actions (¶ [0025]). In the words, the system of Hind renders a graphical representation of stored electronic objects which are organized based on criteria learned by the system as a result of a user's actions. Thus, the system disclosed by Hind *learns criteria for storing objects in an adaptive index*. Hind, however, is silent as to *receiving an index configuration from a user for configuring indexes* of multimedia content, as required by claim 1.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner alleges that Hind discloses the claimed features of "an input unit which receives an index configuration from a user for configuring indexes of multimedia content," as recited in the independent claims. Specifically, the Examiner cites paragraph [0077] of Hind which discloses that *criteria* used for organizing a relational *view* are selected, stored, and *used to create new indexing rules* (see Advisory Action, page 3). On the other hand, as recited in the claims of the present application, *an index configuration* is received from a user and a control unit *produces index information*, *i.e.*, criteria, for having the indexes configured *according to the received index configuration*. Thus, Hind discloses *inputting criteria to create indexes*, while the claimed invention inputs *an index configuration* and *produces index information* based on the index configuration. Therefore, Hind operates in a reverse manner compared to the claimed embodiment.

Further, paragraph [0038] of Hind discloses a user-customizable relational model which allows rendered objects to be organized according to one or more criteria. Thus, paragraph [0038] cited by the Examiner also discloses that *criteria* are used to *create the index*, rather than index information being produced based on an index configuration.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Lennon and Hind since the combined references do not disclose or suggest all of the claimed features.

Independent claim 11 recites features similar to the features recited in claim 1 and is therefore patentable for similar reasons. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-10 and 12-20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from one of claims 1 and 11.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/   Francis G. Platt, Sr.   /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Francis G. Platt, Sr.
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 59,153
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER
Date: March 18, 2010